

taxes every day and are fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan, and all around the world is finally sparking national attention, and even more important, it is sparking bills in the Congress. And bills not only from me and my side of the aisle, but I am pleased to note from my Republican friends.

Several Members are considering or have already put in bills to give voting rights for the residents of the District of Columbia, and all of these are Republican bills and worth noting on this floor. On behalf of the people of the District of Columbia, I want to express my appreciation for these Members who have come forward with their own bills.

The first national interest comes, of course, from our "First in the Nation" primary. It was nonbinding, but that did not much matter. People came out in double the numbers they came out in the 2000 Presidential primary. And they came out because the primary was in part to cast a personal protest vote against paying taxes without representation here in the House, no representation in the Senate whatsoever, and yet serving as we have in our Armed Forces since our Nation was established, all without representation. Today, we are once again disproportionately represented in our Armed Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The bills, however, are not about protest. They are about a remedy. I am still gathering signatures, and am grateful to Members who have signed on to my No Taxation Without Representation Act, and I will continue to do so. Indeed, this bill got out of committee in the Senate a couple of years ago, and I certainly have not given up on it. But I do want to come to the floor this afternoon to say I welcome bills, especially the bills by my Republican friends, and I am very encouraged and will continue to work with them until we get a bill that everybody can agree upon.

My own bill, of course, would give representation in the House and the Senate for the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), Chair of the Committee on Government Reform, which has oversight for the District of Columbia, is considering a bill that would have a House-only seat.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has long favored and often in the past put in bills for voting rights. His is a retrocession bill. D.C. would return to the State of Maryland, that is to say, if Maryland agreed, with Congress maintaining control over the Federal enclave.

And now the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has come forward with a bill that treats the District, for purposes of voting rights only, as Maryland citizens. District residents could vote in Maryland, could run for the Maryland Senate seats. We would remain an independent jurisdiction and there would be no retrocession.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has represented that he is considering a statehood bill. The problem with that, and I appreciate his interest, is that we had a vote on statehood in 1993, but the District had a grave financial problem and had to give back State costs, so we do not presently qualify to become a State.

We are asking for voting representation because every citizen qualifies for representation in her legislature. As long as the Federal Government takes the money of the people I represent every April 15, as long as we have men and women fighting and dying abroad, and today especially in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is simply intolerable for there to be unequal representation.

For my constituents, this is a pure and simple question of disparate treatment, inequality of treatment and discrimination. At a time when we are insisting on democracy not only in Iraq but everywhere we see, everywhere we go in the world, at some point people are going to point their fingers right at us and say, "Why do you not give the same democracy to the people who live closest to you, the people of your own Nation's capital?" To that, our only answer can be, "Duh?"

We do not have any answer. The fact that I have colleagues on the other side of the aisle, three of them, who have come forward with their own bills says to me that there is a gathering consensus that we can, in fact, move forward with a bill.

I am not going to abandon my bill at the moment. Ultimately all of these bills will come together, and I have no doubt that together we can find the solution to the last remaining and most intolerable scar on our democracy.

My thanks, finally and once again, to my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEUGEBAUER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### WHERE IS THE OUTRAGE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in a mood to lament what is going on in this House. The American people, I think, sometimes do not understand what it means to have one-party government. The United States right now is in the hands of one party from the Presidency through the Senate, right on through the House of Representatives. One party makes all of the decisions. That has a very strong effect on what happens around here. Issues that might raise questions if they are in the hands of the majority party are clearly not raised. If they are an issue of the minority party, who cares because the majority is running the place and there is really very little that the majority cannot do, from the way it has handled the Committee on Rules to the way it handles bills all up and down the line.

If it was just the processes of the House that I was depressed or upset about, that would be one thing. But there are huge issues that I think affect the American body politic. When people think about the Congress, there is often a saying, that people like their Congressperson, but they do not like Congress in general because of the things that they see happen here.

The first issue that brought this to my mind was the issue of the outing of a CIA agent by someone in the White House. I am not someone who is enamored of the CIA, but still someone who knows the importance of the CIA; and I believe that the protection of CIA agents is absolutely paramount. We cannot have an intelligence agency that is being exposed on every hand by anybody for any political purpose. The issue comes up, there is no outrage in this body.

We will give them \$40 billion more for the budget for that agency, but we will for political purposes out an agent anytime we feel it is politically, or some people will, anytime they think it is politically expedient. It obviously came from the White House, and we are several months down the road, and there is nothing happening. They have moved it now to a special prosecutor in Chicago. Why there, I do not know. Finally, the Attorney General felt he could not handle it; it was too hot to deal with in the Justice Department, so it is gone.

There are other things that happen here. We have intelligence leaks in the other body. There is no outrage anywhere. No one demands an inquiry because the man who did it apparently, we do not know, and it is not clear who did it, but it is clear there should be an investigation of an intelligence leak. It does not happen. Where is the outrage in this place? Is it only Democrats in the minority that feel outrage? Are there no Republicans who care about the intelligence agencies in this country that allow leaks, allow outing of agents?

The other thing that we do in this House is we deal with public policy,